

COUNTY OF KAUAI  
Minutes of Meeting  
**OPEN SESSION**

Board/Committee:		Kaua‘i Salary Commission		Meeting Date		January 19, 2017	
Location		Mo`ikeha Building – Meeting Room 2A/B		Start of Meeting: 9:00 a.m.		End of Meeting: 10:20 a.m.	
Present		Chair Robert Crowell; Vice-Chair Lenie Nishihira. Members: Daniel Aki, Charles King, Camilla Matsumoto, Jo Ann Shimamoto and Sheri Kunioka-Volz.  Also present: Board & Commissions Office Staff: Support Clerk Mercedes Omo; Administrator Jay Furfaro; Deputy County Attorney Mark Bradbury.					
Excused							
Absent							
SUBJECT		DISCUSSION				ACTION	
Call To Order		Prior to the meeting being called to order, Eddie Topenio Administrative Assistant to the County Clerk gave the Oath of Office to new Commissioner Daniel Aki and reappointed Commissioner Lenie Nishihira.  Chair Crowell welcomed new Commissioner Daniel Aki to the Salary Commission.				Chair Crowell called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. with 7 members present.	
Approval of Minutes		Regular Open Session Minutes of October 20, 2016.				Mr. King moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Ms. Matsumoto seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.	
Business SC 2017-01		<u>Letter dated 12/20/16 from County Council Chair Mel Rapozo to the Chair and Members of the Salary Commission requesting reconsideration of the proposed maximum salaries for the County Auditor, County Clerk and Deputy County Clerk and any salary increase for these position be applied retroactively to July 1, 2016.</u>  Ms. Shimamoto asked if anything was submitted to Council to which Chair Crowell replied no. Administrator Furfaro explained that the Commission submitted its first draft which included the positions that were approved by the Salary Commission in 2016; however, based on the testimony from the Council they indicated that they wanted those positions removed.					

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. King said in other words it wasn't the Salary Commission who unfairly denied them an increase. Administrator Furfaro added that it was their (Council) request and it's recorded in the minutes. Mr. King said the request that came in from Council Rapozo is pretty much asking that the salary increases be retroactive to July 1, 2016 to which Chair Crowell replied yes.</p> <p>Mr. King asked if there was a history of any retroactive salary increases to which Administrator Furfaro replied in is 14 years working across the street and the 2 years he's been in his current position he doesn't recall seeing any retroactive salary increases to which Mr. King replied okay.</p> <p>Ms. Kunioka-Volz asked how the retroactive salaries work when the auditor's position has been vacated since 2015 to which Chair Crowell replied, she asked a good question.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said the fact of the matter is when Council first hired the Auditor that position was in the first tier of the salary grade and then it was vacated. It is his understanding that the Council then went out and started recruiting for a new Auditor and were hopeful to get a Certified Public Accountant for the position because it was one of the criteria's. Relative to the previous Auditor, he had a Masters in degree in Finance, but he did not have CPA (Certified Public Accountant) degree and as everyone knows, he has since terminated his employment. The County the Council went ahead and did some interviews (you may check with Council for clarification) to try to fill the position with someone who was a registered CPA. But till today, they have not been able to find a person at that expected salary range, which is part of the challenge and perhaps is the reason why Council Chair Rapozo is asking for a retroactive salary increase as originally required by ordinance.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Shimamoto said because Council Chair Rapozo is asking that the salaries be retroactive to July 1, 2016, she went back and reviewed the minutes just to refresh her memory. At the time, Council was very adamant about not approving the Resolution and the motion on the floor was to reject the Resolution the Salary Commission had passed. In fact, Council became very upset that they did not garner enough votes to reject Resolution 2016-3.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto added although she was not at the meeting she was taken back because of the comments that were made whereby one of Councilmembers asked why did the Salary Commission submit a Resolution and then come back 2 weeks later to submit another one, only this time the salaries were split; who decides who deserves what. The minutes also indicated that some of the Councilmembers were upset because they couldn't get enough votes to reject the Resolution which included the salaries of the three (3) positions Council Chair Rapozo now wants to be retroactive. She added although Council said that they had no funds to give those positions salary increases, Council Chair Rapozo did say that there was no problem with retention and hiring qualified people and that it was up to each department to manage them.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto said she's quite surprised that Council Chair Rapozo is now coming back to the Commission to ask that the salaries for those three (3) positions be retroactive to July 1, 2016, and his reason is because the Auditor's position is like the Mayor across street whose job is to oversee the department of the County Clerk.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto questioned how they (Council) can make a recommendation and base it on a proposal when the Salary Commission didn't even propose anything (yet), and even if the Commission did, what was proposed last year was ultimately rejected.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Aki asked does the Salary Commissioners set the appropriate caps for the different positions and does the Commission have the authority to raise salaries.</p> <p>Chair Crowell explained that according to the Charter, the Salary Commission sets the maximum salary caps and then makes its recommendation to Council. The appointing authority cannot go above the recommended salary cap, but can go below the cap; correct him if he's wrong, but the elected officials can refuse their salary increases.</p> <p>Mr. Aki asked if the Salary Commission's duty is to recommend salary caps why wouldn't Council approve it and then take it to wherever they need to take it in terms of making a decision on whether to accept or not accept the proposed salaries increases.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said we have a very unique situation in the County and it deals with the fact that there were salary increases given over a period of time at Council and Council services. But the County has gone through a period where in the last 7 years there was a salary freeze and a number of the Department Heads did not receive any raises with the exception of public safety. The Police and Fire Chiefs in that 7 seven years had a mid-point salary increase.</p> <p>Financially speaking, the County is in a financial situation. Since 2012, the County did not receive its share of the transient accommodation tax which put the County in a critical cash position. In fact, the County was short of about \$49 million during those four (4) years so the message from the Council was they were strapped for cash and the Salary Commission response was to create a fourth tier so they could spread out the salaries a little bit by comparing it to the cost of living indexes for that period of time which came to a total of 11.4%. He added that not only did Council chose not to approve any items in the lower tier, they also included a few other positions like the Director of Parks and Recreation and the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Housing Director (because she had only been in her position for a year and half) and the HR Director. In other words, there were a lot of variables that accounted for their rational of not giving any increases.</p> <p>Mr. Aki said it makes sense, asking is the Salary Commission the body who makes recommendations. The reason he asked is because during his interview, Council Chair Rapozo said that whatever the Commission recommends generally gets accepted. So to get clarity, when the Commission makes a recommendation who makes the final decision to (actually) grant the salary increases.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro replied that the Mayor has the final decision. The Salary Commission's job is to recommend the salary caps and the Mayor requires performance reviews that are within the guidelines of civil service and Human Resources. In addition, the Mayor gives the final approval of how close to the caps they would get.</p> <p>Chair Crowell said to clarify, the Mayor is not the only who determines whether or not a Department Head gets an increase or not. There are certain Commissions that have the authority to grant their respective Department Heads an increase at the maximum cap or below. The Planning Commission, Civil Service Commission, Fire Commission and the Police Commission per the Charter has the authority to grant the maximum salary cap set by the Salary Commission or below the cap.</p> <p>Mr. King said once the Council approves a resolution the Salary Commission sends to them they have to include the salary increases into the budget whether it's paid or not because it's their kuleana.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Shimamoto said according to the minutes, County Attorney Mauna Kea Trask clarified that upon the adoption of a Resolution it shall take effect without the Mayor's or Council concurrence (60) days after its adoption <u>unless</u> it's rejected by a vote of not less than 5 members of the Council. The Council may reject either the entire resolution or a portion of it. So in her mind, once the Salary Commission adopts a resolution it has done its job and it's up to Council to reject or accept.</p> <p>Mr. King said that makes sense because if they (Council) doesn't do anything in 90 days it's automatic. Ms. Shimamoto said she's glad that she went back and read the minutes but the stuff that Council said she cannot repeat because they were so upset and questioned the Commission's actions. They (Council) even asked County Attorney Mauna Kea Trask if that was legal and he responded by giving them a history along with some clarification. She added in 2008 or maybe it was in 2009, the Council members got raise along with some other positions and Councilmember Rapozo said "that's when the Salary Commissioners did the thinking on their own and that Council didn't have to approve those raises, which in her mind is not true. Administrator Furfaro replied that is not true. To clarify even further, it was Council's choice to remove the clerk's positions and auditor's position the Commission first proposed.</p> <p>Ms. Matsumoto said she's concerned about approving the request because if you look last year's chunk of positions, the Commission were at the point where it had to deal with the other half. So her question is, what are the other groups are going to say if the Commission were to approve the Chair's request to have the salary retroactive to July 1, 2016. Is it fair? It is her assumption that everybody works hard and are efficient in their positions, not just those three positions.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Aki said it could also set a precedence moving forward. Ms. Matsumoto said if you look at the salaries it reflects 119K, 114K and 119K which is comparable to some of the other positions. Which makes her think if the other members of the group might wonder about their positions. It just doesn't feel good to her.</p> <p>Ms. Nishihira said when comparing the numbers to the Maui and Hawai'i Island counties our County Clerk and the Deputy County clerk salaries are higher than those counties.</p> <p>Ms. Kunioka-Volz said she's agrees with Ms. Matsumoto comments about fairness to all. Those three (3) positions including the County Council received raises in 2009 when no else did.</p> <p>Chair Crowell he recalled that those three (3) positions actually received their raises after 2009 to which Ms. Kunioka-Volz replied those positions received raises on December 1, 2009. But in the same year, the Mayor put a freeze on his staff's raises because of the furlough, but the County Council, Auditor and the Clerk got their raises. Ms. Shimamoto said the same goes for the Prosecutor and his deputies they also received salary increases. Ms. Shimamoto to clarify there were increases proposed in 2009 which she believes was the last increase anybody got. The increases were too be effective on July 1, 2013, but in 2012 the increase were deleted. Chair Crowell said he recalls that.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto noted that the Police and Fire Chiefs and their respective deputies received increase in 2012.</p> <p>Mr. King said if he recalls in 2014, the Commission submitted their resolution to early. They submitted the resolution before Council had the chance to get the numbers and they rejected the resolution. But last year, the Commission timed it properly, but Council did not accept all of the recommendations so the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Commission went back and submitted a higher tier for Council to approve.</p> <p>Chair Crowell asked if the Commissioners if they anymore discussion relating to Council Chair Rapozo's letter.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said he would like to provide a summary to put things into perspective. The Salary Commission's approach to the schedule was based on a memorandum which the Commission shared with the other counties. On point 6, the reference to the recent raises that were given in that particular year was based on a report from the Hawai'i Employment Council, the Honolulu Price Index for the years 2010- 2014, the upcoming bargaining unit rates that were being forecasted for 2017, market comparisons, salary inversions for police and fire including the discussion on changing the 3 salary tier to a 4 salary tier.</p> <p>Mr. King commented as far as Chair Rapozo's letter Resolution 2017-1 does everything but extend the increases retroactively.</p> <p>Chair Crowell questioned where the Commission should take it from here.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said contrary to the comment Mr. King just made his interpretation of what Chair Rapozo's is trying convey is the proposal for the Auditor's position of \$119,000 is not enough.</p> <p>Both Mr. King and Ms. Kunioka-Volz both said they didn't read it that way all. Their interpretation from reading the letter is that the County Clerk, Deputy County Clerk and the Auditor didn't get an increase and now Council Chair Rapozo is requesting reconsideration of the proposed maximum salaries for the County Auditor, County Clerk and Deputy County Clerk and any salary increases for those positon should be retroactive to July 1, 2016.</p>	



SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Administrator Furfaro said there are three parts to his letter: 1. Retroactive request; 2. No salary increase for staff, and 3. The recruitment for the Auditor's position.</p> <p>Ms. Kunioka-Volz said what Council Chair Rapozo is also saying is that those salaries shouldn't have been placed in the lower tier. Chair Crowell said he thinks Council Chair Rapozo meant to say that all three (3) positions shouldn't have been placed in the lower tier.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto said in actuality the language "lower tier" is not the language the Salary Commission used. Because when the positions were first submitted in the original resolution the Salary Commission didn't set it up by tiers.</p> <p>Mr. King added he cannot remember whether the Salary Commission did it or HR did it, but there were different salary maximums and five (5) divisions.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said some of the lower tiers had those positions in there and if he recalls, the Administration and HR indicated to the Commission that there are certain Departments that are slated for retirements and those position maybe converted into civil service positions i.e. the Housing Department and Transportation, which contributed to it as well.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto said her notes from way back shows when the Commission first started there were no formal tiers. Mr. King added there were no grade levels also.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto said it was based on the salaries each Department Head got and the five (5) tiers were based on the separation of salaries and the Commission went ahead and condensed the five (5) into 4 tiers based on the salaries. According to her notes, the County Clerk's position of \$119,357 was in tier 2. So just because that position was placed in the second half because the Commission split it Council is now referring it to a lower tier, but that was not the Commission's doing.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. King said based on Ms. Shimamoto's comments those position are actuality in the top tier and not in the lower tier. Chair Crowell said if you read Chair Rapozo's letter all he's saying is he doesn't want those three (3) positions included in the lower tier of the Department Heads. He's not necessarily saying that they are in the lower tier.</p> <p>Ms. Kunioka-Volz said she thinks what Chair Rapozo is trying to say is they should have not been included in the lower tier. Chair Crowell said he agrees and you could probably say that about Parks too because as he recalls, the Commission said that Parks should have been included in the upper tier, but the second time around (and he doesn't remember who said it) there was some discussion about leaving Parks in the lower tier so the Commission basically pulled those positions out of the upper tier and placed them in the lower tier based on the recommendation from Council.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto said she recalls there were at least 2 or 3 council members who came to the Commission's meeting to say that this is where the cut-off should be. And County Attorney Mauna Kea Trask pointed it out to them that the separation of the Resolution was an action taken by the Salary Commission based on the comments that were made by the councilmembers at the Salary Commission meeting.</p> <p>Ms. Matsumoto said maybe this would be a good time to focus on the 2017-1 Resolution and present it as is. Chair Crowell said going back to Chair Rapozo's letter does he have a motion to approve his request. Mr. King said does he mean accept to which Chair Crowell replied yes, the motion is to accept and not approve the request. Ms. Shimamoto asked shouldn't the Commission receive the letter as opposed to accepting it.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Administrator Furfaro said if the Commission chooses to receive the letter it would not appear as an agenda item going forward, but if the Commission accepts the letter the Commission is recognizing its intent. Chair Crowell asked if the Commissioners wants to receive or accept the letter.</p> <p>Ms. Kunioka-Volz asked by accepting the letter does it mean the Commission is approving its intent. Administrator Furfaro said there is three (3) different tiers of discussion involving the letter. The Chair with the approval of the Commissioners may ask to put part of the letter on a future communication.</p> <p>Mr. King said it would seem that the letter deserves a response and the response could say something like the Commission is forwarding the 2017-1 Resolution in a motion to him (Chair Rapozo) and if the Commission decides not to approve his request to retroactive the salaries, the letter could state that the Salary Commission did not see any precedent to feel that a retroactive approval was appropriate at this time.</p> <p>Ms. Kunioka-Volz asked because the Auditor's position was never filled but already budgeted for would the funds go back into the General Fund or would it remain at Council. Administrator Furfaro said the monies in the operating budget that are not spent would go back as a possible contribution to the Reserve Fund, which means the money would not go away it will remain as part of the Reserve Fund. Ms. Kunioka-Volz asked if the Reserve Fund is kept separate from Council to which Administrator Furfaro replied no, the County has only one Reserve Fund.</p> <p>Ms. Nishihira asked if a motion to respond to Chair Rapozo's request would be appropriate at this time. Administrator Furfaro said there are two steps to the letter. The first step is to accept the letter and second the step is to respond to the Chair to tell him that the Commission has considered his request, but when it comes to whether or not you want to retroact the salaries is for the Commission to decide.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Nishihira noted just for the increases correct? And not the request to have the salaries retroactive to July 1, 2016 to which Administrator Furfaro replied correct. Ms. Shimamoto asked if it's the Commission's intent to respond in writing to which Administrator Furfaro replied that would be the appropriate thing to do. Chair Crowell agreed.</p> <p>Ms. Matsumoto said the motion should be to accept the communication. Chair Crowell replied the motion was already made and seconded.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto asked by accepting the letter does it mean the Commission has accepted it only for discussion to which Administrator Furfaro replied yes, noting that the appropriate thing to do is to respond in writing to Council Chair Rapozo as to what the Commission has decided.</p> <p>Mr. King said at this point, the Commission should accept the letter and quote Resolution 2017-1 and once the Resolution is done, then the Commission can talk about the response to the letter.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro asked Deputy County Attorney Bradbury if he concurs with what the Commission is saying. Mr. Bradbury asked if the Commission is talking about going forward with Resolution 2017-1 or does the Commission want to approve Council Chair Rapozo's request to retroactive the salaries, and if yes, the Commission needs to amend the 2016 Resolution. Administrator Furfaro asked does it need to be done when the Commission submits a new package to which Mr. Bradbury replied yes.</p> <p>Ms. Kunioka-Volz asked is the Commission going to accept the communication and then vote on whether or not to approve the request. Chair Crowell said the Commissioners is going to accept the communication and then send a response to Council Chair Rapozo. But from what he gathers, Mr. King is suggesting that the</p>	<p>Mr. King moved to accept the letter from Council Chair Rapozo dated 12/20/16. Ms. Matsumoto seconded the motion.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Commission look at Resolution 2017-1 and determine what its wants to do which will be part of the Commission's response to Council Chair Rapozo.</p> <p>Ms. Kunioka-Volz said if the Commission decides to approve Council Chair Rapozo's request then the Commissioners would need to amend the 2016 Resolution. Chair Crowell replied, correct, the Commission would need to amend the 2016 Resolution.</p> <p>Mr. Bradbury said it is his understanding that Resolution 2016 was amended three (3) times already so this will be the fourth amendment to the 2016 Resolution. Mr. King pointed out that's only if the Commission decides to go with the retroactive to which Chair Crowell replied correct.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro added based on the discussion, if the Commission decides to retroact the salaries the money would come out of the 2016 budget.</p> <p>Ms. Nishihira said taking one step at a time as Mr. King had recommended is the appropriate thing to do that is to accept the communication call for a second and then the Commissioners can discuss its response to Council Chair Rapozo's letter.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said to clarify, the motion on the floor is not to approve Council Chair Rapozo's request; the Commission is just accepting the letter with a response to the Chair. Ms. Shimamoto said in other words, the Commissioners are only agreeing to accept the letter to which Chair Crowell replied yes.</p> <p>Ms. Nishihira asked in regard to parliamentary procedures once a motion is made and voted on, there should be no follow-up discussion right? And shouldn't the discussion occur prior to the vote.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Administrator Furfaro explained that the discussion is occurring right now because a motion was made and seconded. The motion on the floor is to accept the letter it doesn't mean the Commission is approving Council Chair Rapozo's request. And as Mr. King pointed out earlier, a letter would later follow as to what the Commission wants to recommend.</p> <p>Chair Crowell said if there is no further discussion, the motion on the floor is to accept the communication dated 12/20/16 from Council Chair Mel Rapozo; all those in favor, please signify by saying aye. Opposed? Hearing none. The motion carries 7:0.</p>	<p>The motion carried 7:0 to accept the letter.</p>
<p><b>SC 2016-04</b></p>	<p><u>Discussion and decision-making with regard to submitting a Resolution establishing the maximum cap for salaries for the fiscal year 2017/2018 for the lower tier and employees included in Section 3-2.1 of the Kaua'i County Code (Deferred 10/20/16)</u></p> <p>a. Draft Resolution 2017-1.</p> <p>Chair Crowell called for a motion to approve Resolution 2017-1.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p>Mr. King said this is pretty much mirrors what the Commission talked about last year and it was just a matter of timing. Chair Crowell said because there was some discussion about the County Council he would like to open the floor for discussion for those who may have some concerns about the County Council's salary increase.</p> <p>Mr. King said he thought the Commission all agreed that they could take that part out the last time. Administrator Furfaro said yes, you can and vote on the line item. Ms. Nishihira asked just to clarify, the Council's salary increase wouldn't take effect until 2018 and the other positions would take effect on</p>	<p>Mr. King moved to approve Resolution 2017-1. Mr. Aki seconded the motion.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>July 1, 2017. Chair Crowell replied, correct.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said Council cannot approve any increases in the year in which they were elected. Mr. King said he would not recommend doing anything retroactively and stay the course just like how the Commission has done in the past.</p> <p>Ms. Matsumoto said from what she can recall from last year, the County Council wanted to take that section out (their members) and they may want to do the same thing this year, but at this point the Commissioners wouldn't know what Council wants to do. Chair Crowell asked Commissioners if they want to make a recommendation to take that section out. Ms. Matsumoto said she would leave it as is.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto said she agrees with Ms. Matsumoto to submit Resolution 2017-1 as is. She noted that one of the things she found when reading the minutes from the Commission's October meeting is the Commission had asked for job descriptions for the Director of Parks &amp; Recreation and the other department heads.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro provided the Commissioners with copies of the unofficial job descriptions. Ms. Shimamoto thanked Administrator Furfaro for the information, noting that at least now, the Commission has something it can refer to in case, Council have questions about why some positions are included in the top tier and others were not.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said if that happens the response should come from HR because the Salary Commission scope of responsibilities does not include drafting job descriptions.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Shimamoto said she appreciates him putting together the information, asking what about the other job descriptions and because it's an unofficial draft can the Commission use it. Administrator Furfaro explained that he created the draft of job descriptions to catch the attention of the HR Department because he cannot direct HR to write job descriptions.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto asked if it was possible to get copies of the documents HR has. Chair Crowell recalled that HR did provide the Commission with the job descriptions. Ms. Shimamoto said according to the October meeting minutes, the Commission asked for a copy of all of the job descriptions and HR was going to provide the information. The minutes also says that although Ms. Rapozo was away for most of the month to deal with union negotiations the Commission would still get the information.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said the draft documents that is before the Commission today, is the same document that he submitted to HR. Ms. Kunioka-Volz said from what she gathers there was no response from Ms. Rapozo.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto said from what she's hearing HR does not have any job descriptions to which Administrator Furfaro said he doesn't want to go on record on anything relating to HR, all he saying is, the Commission raised the question at the last meeting and so he took it upon himself created unofficial job descriptions and now it's time for HR to come back a response. They are aware that the three (3) positions are without job descriptions and in their defense he also knows that they are working on establishing the job descriptions for the entire County.</p> <p>Ms. Matsumoto aside from the job descriptions and for discussion purposes it would be appropriate to move forward with Resolution 2017-1.</p>	



SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Administrator Furfaro said he also thinks it would be great (if the Commission agrees) to have the Chair send a correspondence to HR requesting that they provide an update of the job descriptions at a future Salary Commission meeting.</p> <p>Chair Crowell said Jay did a great job updating the job descriptions and if the Commission were to go across the street and Council begins to ask those type of questions, he would be more than willing to use the documents especially because there's nothing official than what Administrator Furfaro has provided reflects the scope of all of the jobs. In addition, he also heard that Public Works shifted a lot of their work responsibilities over to the Parks &amp; Recreation Department and while he disagreed from the start, he now believes that Parks &amp; Rec should have been placed in the upper tier (from the last go around) mainly because of the fact that they didn't need more work but ended up with more work.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto said with all things considered she supports Resolution 2017-1 but what she's accustom to is when you ask for job qualifications and job descriptions it should come from HR.</p> <p>Ms. Kunioka-Volz asked whenever reorganization occurs does it delete the existing director's position or does it add on. Administrator Furfaro said not in the Parks &amp; Rec case. What they did was shift some of the responsibilities because of the expanding duties of the County Engineer. Take Maui for instance, they have two Engineers, one for the landfill and one for Repair &amp; Maintenance. But on Kaua'i all of those duties fall under the County Engineer. In other words, they didn't eliminate the position they just reallocated the responsibilities to other job descriptions.</p> <p>Ms. Kunioka-Volz said it's her understanding that at one time, the County did not have a Director of Parks &amp; Recreation it only had a Director of Public Works and that the Parks Department came under the purview of Public Works. And they did</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>the reorganization that's when HR created a new Parks and Recreation Director position which means the existing salary recommendation for the Director of Public Works should stay the same right?</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro replied yes, and if the Chair agrees he will draft a letter to the Director of Human Resources requesting her presence at a future Salary Commission to provide an update on the job descriptions.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto asked for clarification is the draft job descriptions he provided to the Commissioners is the same draft that's being considered by HR to which Administrator Furfaro replied yes, noting that the draft of job descriptions he submitted to HR was done in response to the Commission's inquiries about the job descriptions which began from comments that were made by Council.</p> <p>Ms. Kunioka-Volz said the way she see it, the Commission will still get blasted by Council especially when it comes to how the Commission justified their actions without seeing any of the job descriptions.</p> <p>Ms. Matsumoto said it should fall on HR because the Commission is doing the best it can. Ms. Kunioka-Volz replied and the Commission's response to Council should be the job descriptions were not ready or it wasn't available.</p> <p>Chair Crowell said yes, because he would imagine HR is in the process of reviewing all of the job descriptions. Mr. King reminded the Commissioners that they did a comparison of all the salaries statewide including the cost of living and the report from the Hawai'i Employers Council.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said it refers to the 6 points he mentioned earlier in his letter to which Mr. King replied right. Ms. Kunioka-Volz said the Commission did the same thing last year and still got flack.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Matsumoto said in the first half that was passed last year, the Commission didn't have any job descriptions to work with and it's the same thing for this year. So in her opinion, the Commission is in a strong place to present Resolution 2017-1.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto said the Commissioners have to remember that when the Resolution was passed by the Salary Commission Council attempted to reject the Resolution but they didn't. But overall, she thinks the Commission will be successful (this time) if its submits what it already has because of the fact that the other Department Heads received raises and the others did not in seven (7) years.</p> <p>Mr. King said it's not about being successful, the Commission is doing what is right which is what it tried to do last year. The Commission had to take a fallback position outside of being successful and now, all the Commission is trying to complete the job it tried to do last year.</p> <p>Mr. Aki said the only pushback the Commission may have is with the bottom three (3) positions. The County Clerk, Deputy County Clerk and the County Auditor and no one else. Mr. King said the ones Mel wrote about. Mr. Aki replied, yes, and that's where a lot of the questions will come from.</p> <p>Chair Crowell ask what is he referring to in terms of the pushback. Mr. King replied he thinks Council is going try to move those positions into the top tier or revisit what they think the salary cap should be. Ms. Shimamoto said those three (3) positions are already in the top tier. Chair Crowell recalls those three (3) positions being in the top tier including Parks but it was Council's recommendation to remove those three (3) positions; all the Commission did was take those positons and put them where they are today.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Aki said it will all come down to what the letter is going to imply and those three (3) positions is going to be scrutinized more closely.</p> <p>Ms. Matsumoto said last year, a lot of the other officers attended the meeting because they wanted to get raises as well so she wouldn't be surprised at all if those people showed up again.</p> <p>Chair Crowell said if there's no further discussion, he would call for the vote.</p> <p>Chair Crowell said as a recap is the Office of Boards and Commissions drafting the letter for his signature. Administrator Furfaro replied that he would ask Mercedes to draft the letter and in the letter it will state that the Commission is going to inform Council Chair Rapozo (since he wasn't here today) that the Commission has reviewed the letter and will take his request under consideration in the future.</p> <p>Additionally, Administrator Furfaro asked at what point the Commission would like to formally send the letter to Council Chair Rapozo and inform the Mayor of what took place today. He asked because as of right now, the Administration is being its departmental budget review sessions and they would have to program the salaries whether its' approved or not.</p> <p>Chair Crowell said it would be appropriate to inform the Mayor as soon as possible, asking if the CAFR from last year was already submitted.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said the final CAFR it will be presented to the Council in December or January so they'll know from the Auditors report if there are any carryovers or surplus. He added if the Commission wants, he can ask Finance Director Ken Shimonishi to a make presentation on the CAFR at a future Commission meeting.</p>	<p>The motion carried 7:0 to approve Resolution 2017-1.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Kunioka-Volz asked how soon the Commission can expect Resolution 2017-1 to be considered by Council. Administrator Furfaro replied March 15 is the date the budget reviews starts. Mr. King said from what he understands the ticker starts when the Commission sends over the Resolution.</p> <p>Chair Crowell asked if another meeting is needed for the Commissioner's to sign Resolution 2017-1. Ms. Omo informed the Commissioners that Resolution 2017-1 is available for signature. Administrator Furfaro suggested that the Commission meet in early March before the budget reviews starts. He added that although the Administration and the Departments are working on their respective budgets there's still enough time for the Mayor to provide instructions (to Finance) as it relates to Resolution 2017-1.</p> <p>Chair Crowell asked if anyone has a preference on when Resolution 2017-1 should go over to Council. He added because it's a timing issue should the Commission sign Resolution 2017-1 today and then send over to Council immediately or should the Commission respond to Council Chair Rapozo's request first.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said the Commission should response to Council Chair Rapozo simultaneously to inform him that the Commission accepted his commentary and will consider it going forward. Mr. King suggested sending the Commission's response along with Resolution 2017-1 to say the Commission considered his letter and approved everything except for retroactive salary increase. Ms. Matsumoto said the Commission should sign Resolution 2017-1 today and move forward.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto recalled at the Commission's last meeting, there was a question of passing the Resolution and then sending it over later, but there was some concerns about the Council asking how come it took so long.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Administrator Furfaro said the last time the Commission sent over the Resolution was in November. Ms. Shimamoto said no, the discussion she's referring to was at the last meeting in regard to Resolution 2017-1. The discussion was about how the Commission could have passed the Resolution at that time but decided to hold off and send it over later. A question was brought up by you (Administrator Furfaro) that Council may ask how come the Commission passed the Resolution so early and they got later.</p> <p>Administrator Furfaro said the answer is simple, the Commission passed the Resolution early but not as early as previous years. In this case, you passed a resolution in time for it to be considered for the budget. He added last time, the previous Resolution went over was in November and the CAFR wasn't completed then and Council didn't know whether or not they a surplus or if there was anything left. But this time they (Council) have the CAFR.</p> <p>Ms. Shimamoto said the Commission passes the Resolution; submits it to Council and once Council receives it the 90 days starts to which Administrator replied yes, adding that he understands why it can be so confusing because the County has 13 months in a year. The County has 12 months to produce its financial which ends in July, but in July they are stilling reconciling all of the bills which means, the County has no clear picture until August which is when the Auditors will come and do their assessment and then make their presentation on CAFR to Council.</p> <p>Chair Crowell asked when everything would be ready to move across the street. Administrator Furfaro replied sometime within the next 10 days.</p> <p>With no further discussion, Chair Crowell called for a motion to adjourn.</p>	
<b>Announcements</b>	<p>The Salary Commission's next meeting will be scheduled in first week in March. Once Staff makes the arrangements she would inform the Commissioners via</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	email in a timely manner.	
<b>Adjournment</b>		Mr. King moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Kunioka-Volz seconded the motion. The motion carried 6:0.  At 10:20 a.m. the meeting adjourned.

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mercedes Omo, Staff Support Clerk

Reviewed and Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Robert Crowell, Chair

☒ Approved as circulated on March 23, 2017

☐ Approved as amended. See minutes of \_\_\_\_\_ meeting.